



Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 112

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 1966

No. 56

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Friday, April 1, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rev. Victor S. Koontz, First Christian Church, Disciples of Christ, Hooversville, Pa., offered the following prayer: Almighty God, Fountainhead of all wisdom, Creator of all existence, Author of life, and Preserver of peace, grant this day the visitation of Thy Holy Spirit upon the deliberations of this body as it seeks to unite our great Nation in the common good for all.

Give to each legislator wisdom and harmony in cooperating with and in the support of the interests of Thy people at home and abroad. May the actions of this assembly today become the will of God, the consent of the governed, and the choice of all who seek freedom.

Bless every effort expended toward the causes of man's questing for truth, justice, and peace with all others whom Thou hast fashioned after Thyself. Through Jesus, the Christ, our Lord, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee on mines and mining of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXPORT-CONTROL ORDER ON HIDES

(Mr. EDMONDSON asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, several days ago eight Members of the House joined in a request to three of the major committees of this body to investigate certain aspects of the recent export-control order on hides. Our request followed information which was supplied to us by the Secretary of Commerce in a meeting in the office of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] that the price on military shoes was expected to go up or was already up about \$1.75 a pair notwithstanding what they thought was a commitment by shoe manufacturers to hold the price of shoes down if they were able to get controls on exports of hides.

Since that time the Washington Star on March 29 has announced a 4½-percent price increase by two major shoe companies in St. Louis.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] has also received information from the Defense Supply Agency that the price for low-quarter shoes to the Army is going up from \$5.75 to \$8.75 on July 1, 1966, an increase of more than 50 percent in the price of low-quarter military shoes.

Now very obviously there needs to be an investigation of what appears to be war profiteering by some shoe companies, especially in view of the export-control orders which were placed on hides. I think the export-control orders should be terminated without delay and I think the shoe companies should be brought before the proper congressional committee and a thorough investigation conducted.

WHY SAVE HAIPHONG?

(Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, not very long ago I made the statement on my own responsibility that there was on the high seas a Soviet ship which I conjectured was headed for Haiphong.

In order to keep the American people properly informed I would like to report to the House—and the American people—the fact that the Soviet ship *Sovetsk* arrived in Haiphong Harbor at 1:35 p.m., Saigon time, on March 23, or 10:35 a.m., March 24, Washington time.

This ship—I am reliably informed—is reportedly carrying 2 MI-6 Soviet helicopters.

These helicopters are reportedly the largest in the world, and have a lift and carrying capacity far in excess of anything we possess.

I saw them at the Paris Air Show last year.

They are big—and they are reportedly efficient.

If my information is correct, their delivery to the North Vietnamese—through Haiphong Harbor—and the courtesy of the sanctuary we have so far provided—will improve the supply situation of the Vietcong by a very considerable amount.

I continue to ask the question, "Why save Haiphong? Why save Haiphong?"

PLEASE—NO BULLETS FROM OUR FRIENDS

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, our Government does not control the policies of the West German Government. Nevertheless, I hope that strong representations are being made to the West Germans against their plans to help build a steel mill in Red China. It should be very plain that the Red Chinese Government is a belligerent one, which is agitating

the conflict in South Vietnam. It is known that the Red Chinese are the principal source of weapons and ammunition which are being used by the Vietcong and North Vietnamese against our forces there. It is also known that Red Chinese labor forces in numbers estimated at 20,000 to 35,000 are in North Vietnam, helping to build, maintain, and repair roads, railroads, and bridges, which keep open the supply lines and troop routes to South Vietnam for the Communist forces.

A steel mill in Red China will certainly contribute to the economic strength of that nation and directly or indirectly to Red China's ability to provide weapons of war. It is very likely that American dollars spent for the development of West Germany would also contribute to build the steel mill in Red China. There is equal likelihood that such a steel mill would provide bullets to kill Americans in South Vietnam, or it would free other facilities to do so. It is not in any sense, in the best interest of the free world for this mill to be built. There is even less reason for a leading nation in the free world forces to make construction of the mill possible.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight Saturday, April 2, 1966, to file a report on H.R. 14025, to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE ALBERT THOMAS

(Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, at its meeting on March 25 the Committee on Appropriations adopted a set of resolutions memorializing the life and service of our late beloved colleague, the Honorable Albert Thomas, of Texas. I insert a copy of the resolutions in the Record at this point so that they may be included in the permanent compilation of eulogies on our departed colleague.

A RESOLUTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS CONCERNING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF THE LATE HONORABLE ALBERT THOMAS OF TEXAS

Whereas on the morning of Tuesday, the 15th of February 1966, the Honorable Albert Thomas of Texas, in his 30th consecutive year as a Member of the House of Representatives in the service of his country, crossed the great threshold in response to a call from his Maker; and

Whereas for more than a quarter of a century Congressman Albert Thomas served diligently and faithfully as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, providing outstanding service in the administration of the budgetary and appropriation processes of the

Nation, accumulating a fund of knowledge about the operations of the agencies and departments of Government; and

Whereas Congressman Albert Thomas, combining this vast fund of knowledge with gifts of persuasion and great courage, was a tireless and talented legislator, an effective leader, who with force of character tempered by a just spirit of mind and heart, walked the corridors of power nobly; and

Whereas in the words of the late President Kennedy, Congressman Albert Thomas was characterized as a statesman with "a young man's interest in the future and a young man's hope for his country" who not only represented his district with distinction but also served well the United States; and

Whereas in the words of President Johnson, "of the qualities that made Albert Thomas a remarkable man, devotion to the people he served and loyalty to his friends stand higher than all": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Committee on Appropriations, recognize that in the passing of our colleague, Albert Thomas, we have lost a courageous leader and beloved friend; and be it further

Resolved, That we extend our deepest sympathy to his wife and other members of his family; and, therefore, be it further

Resolved, That these resolutions be entered in the journal of this committee, a copy sent to Mrs. Thomas, and that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations arrange to include a copy of these resolutions in the ceremonial proceedings of the House of Representatives.

THE STATE OF ISRAEL

(Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the 25th day of April 1966, which is equivalent to the 5th day of Iyar in the Hebrew calendar, the State of Israel will celebrate its 18th year of independence. I intend to ask for a special order on that day—I am sure that many of our colleagues will desire to extend their greetings and felicitations to this new State, the bastion of democracy in the Middle East. I welcome their participation in my special order on April 25.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may have until midnight Friday, April 1, to file a report on H.R. 7406.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WAR PROFITEERING IN THE SHOE INDUSTRY

(Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I joined with eight other Members of the House in a bipartisan appeal for an inquiry into the war profiteering that seems to exist in the shoe industry. Many of us in livestock areas have been shocked at the imposition of hide quotas by the De-

partment of Commerce which are damaging greatly the economic stability of the livestock industry, which will cause an increase in the price of meat to the housewife, and which also harms our balance-of-payments position in the world.

In light of the Secretary of Commerce's supposed encouragement for American businessmen to seek cash export markets, we are at a loss to determine the reason for this arbitrary order. We had a conference with the Secretary and a number of individuals from the Department of Commerce last Monday, and the major reason they gave for this hide export quota was the fact that the price of military footwear had gone up approximately \$1.75 per pair during the 7-month period from August 1935 to March 1966. They went from approximately \$6.25 to \$8 per pair. Information we have just received indicates that the price increase was even greater than the one the Secretary mentioned—also contrasting to approximately a 5-percent increase for civilian footwear for the same period of time.

Few Members of this House have any time for those who would profiteer in war and if this profiteering is the reason for the hide export order, certainly both the profiteering and the export order should be stopped immediately. I am happy to join my friend and colleague, Ed Edmondson, in calling this serious matter to the attention of the House.

BOYCOTT OF TRADE WITH RED CHINA

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, at long last the administration has moved boldly to persuade our free world allies to boycott trade with Red China. Last week, the Treasury announced that it had negotiated agreements with Britain, Belgium, France, Japan, South Korea, Hong Kong, India, and Taiwan to ban from their exports to the United States wigs made from human hair obtained in Red China, North Korea and North Vietnam. That is cooperation with a vengeance.

Let me suggest that the administration got its signals crossed. The problem of free world trade with our Communist enemies is not to keep false hair—Red hair, if you like—off the heads of American women but to grow real hair on the chest of the State Department.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee may have until midnight Friday, April 1, 1966, to file a report on H.R. 14122, to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

A1890

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 31, 1966

He has served both in Washington and in the field in Western States and Alaska.

Secretary Udall has promised that a reorganization is coming at the top level of the Bureau "to make it more action minded, to speed up the process of serving Indians." The Bennett appointment should be used by the Nation as a time to take a new look at its neglected responsibilities to its Indian neighbors.

Vietnam Debate Reflects the American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, debate and discussion over our mission and obligation in Vietnam have been much in the news the last few months. There are those who feel such debate—coming, as it does, largely from within the ranks of the Democratic Party—hinders our Vietnam efforts.

I feel that such debate is not only fundamental to the American way of going about things, but also it aids in formulating a national resolve by thoroughly airing the complexities of the picture. I bring this up because Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, recently delivered a speech on the subject in Denver. I had the privilege of hearing that speech, delivered at the annual Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner of the Colorado Democratic Party. I want to share Senator PROXMIRE's excellent words with my colleagues, and I respectfully include that portion of the Senator's address pertaining to Vietnam in the RECORD:

I support the administration position in Vietnam. I support it because it has wisely accommodated to the constructive criticisms of Democratic critics.

Senators MANSFIELD, MORSE, ROBERT KENNEDY, and others have done far more than keep the U.S. Senate's tradition of debate and discussion alive. They have made explicit suggestions that have been accepted and have measurably improved the administration's position in Vietnam.

As an administration supporter in Vietnam I say thank God for Senator FULBRIGHT's courageous insistence on holding open hearings on what we are doing to achieve negotiations and a defensible peace in South Vietnam.

Those hearings not only vastly increased public understanding of the stringent limitations on our alternatives in Vietnam, they also forced the administration to rethink and clarify as well as defend its position there.

The Fulbright followthrough with hearings on Red China have contributed a far greater understanding in Congress and the country of China, and how we can best pursue Asiatic freedom and peace—in Vietnam and elsewhere.

This country has never engaged in a war in which the party controlling the Government has itself had such a monopoly on criticism or in which that criticism has been so consistent and powerful. And certainly we have never before so clearly incorporated that criticism so quickly into our national policy.

Critics asked the President to call for a ceasefire. The President has done so.

They called for a lengthy bombing pause. The President did just that.

They asked the administration to put the controversy before the United Nations. It has done that.

They called for our reaffirmation of the Geneva accords, and our request for reconvening the Geneva Convention to act as intermediaries. The President has done this.

They called for a vigorous peace offensive. The President sent his top foreign policy officials throughout the world in the most vigorous peace offensive the Nation has ever engaged in.

They asked that we call for a free election in South Vietnam and announce we would abide by the results even if the Communists won. President Johnson has done this.

They called on the President to accept a Vietnam-wide election—north and south—and abide by the results. The President has agreed to do so.

They have asked that the war be limited to military targets. It has been rigorously so limited.

They ask that we not insist on unconditional surrender by the North Vietnamese. The President has made it clear that we do not insist on unconditional surrender; that we will not invade North Vietnam.

We are not bombing Hanoi, nor blockading Haiphong; we covet not a foot of Vietnam territory, north or south; we want no base in Vietnam; we do not ask that South Vietnam align herself with us.

Indeed, we offer a billion-dollar economic reconstruction program after the war to include North Vietnam itself.

At the moment the difference between President Johnson's position and that of his toughest critics in the Democratic Party in the Senate is a narrow hair's breadth.

Neither would withdraw from Vietnam.

Neither wants a wholesale attack on North Vietnam.

Both want to negotiate peace as soon as possible.

Both want the people of South Vietnam to decide their future freely.

This is a national policy that unites the Democratic Party and the Nation. It does not divide our party or our country. It is no accident that the demonstrations, the teach-ins, the sign-carrying protests, the peace marches have all but ceased.

We have at last a national policy in Vietnam that won overwhelming national support. And it has been won in the best American tradition—by debate, dissent, discussion.

Of course, differences remain but they are differences over military tactics or political ambitions or just plain personal animosities, and as long as we're human those differences will always be with us.

Census Bureau Report on Building Research Programs of National Bureau of Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1966

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the building industry of the United States, according to recent Census Bureau report, accounts for one-seventh of the gross national

product and about 10 million Americans have jobs related to this important \$90 billion segment of our economy. These figures illustrate why all Americans have an interest in the progress and development of building, and in a good working relationship between the industry and appropriate agencies of the Federal Government.

Over the years such a relationship has existed between the building industry and the National Bureau of Standards. The Bureau of Standards has contributed greatly in building research, and industry has cooperated with the Bureau.

Recent discussions about the future of this relationship and of the expanded research that may be required by the continued unprecedented growth of building led to a paper outlining the purposes, intent, and scope of the building research programs of the Bureau of Standards which I wish to submit for the RECORD. The paper follows:

CENSUS BUREAU REPORT

INTRODUCTION

This is a statement of the purpose, intent, and scope of the building research programs of the National Bureau of Standards. It does not purport to limit, or circumscribe, thereby the role or responsibilities of any other Federal agency. It is presented for discussion and comment by all of those industries, professional organizations, and trade associations which share with us an interest in advancing the scientific and technological capacity of the Nation for the creation of better buildings.

THE PAST HISTORY

Shortly after its formation 64 years ago the National Bureau of Standards became engaged in research work related to building. During this time the associated building industries (hereafter called the building industry) have utilized much that has resulted from the NBS research as background knowledge materially assisting in industry progress. Through these years the building industry has cordially and effectively supported building research at the Bureau and has continuously carried on joint cooperative work with the NBS research groups. The cooperation has taken many forms, such as, maintenance of research associate-ships at NBS; efforts in codes and standards organizations where industry and NBS personnel have acted in close union to develop building standards on which the industry depends; contract research with industry groups, and daily personal exchanges of information and advice between NBS and industry scientists, engineers, and administrators.

In the course of the past six decades building research at the NBS, and elsewhere has changed character as building technology developed. It has been extended in some directions or diminished in others so that at all times it would be in accord with the needs of the Nation. (These changes have often been carried out with the advice and knowledge of the building industry.)

The historic building research programs of the NBS have been in the field of science of materials, structures, mechanical and electrical services, fire and combustion, and other related fields of building technology. The results of the work have been disseminated in many ways: Publication in BMS (building materials and structures) series of brochures; participation by NBS personnel in professional, scientific, and engineering societies; participation by building research personnel in committees developing building standards and codes; books and lectures

March 31, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

with today's record tight money and the possibility of increased taxes, a price rise of less than 2 percent seems doubtful. Many observers think we'll break the 3 percent mark.

Forecast: Business spending for plants and equipment will rise but the advance is not expected to match the 15½-percent increase of last year.

Updating: The latest Government survey puts the rise in plant and equipment spending at 16 percent to an alltime peak of \$60.2 billion—an all-out investment boom on top of 1965's boom on top of 1964's powerful upsurge. This is simply too much spending in an economy obviously straining at a capacity of materials, manpower, and money. This spending must be stretched out (by design) to avert the danger of too much building now and sharp cutbacks later—the boom-bust investment cycle.

EMPLOYMENT MOUNTING

Forecast: Unemployment as 1966 progresses will be below 4 percent, lowest since 1953.

Updating: It already has happened. In February, the jobless rate dropped to 3.7 percent and the Government now acknowledges labor shortages in leading areas.

Were today March 22 of any year from 1960 through 1965, I would have applauded the upward revisions, for they would have signaled gains in our drive toward broad prosperity with stable prices. But on this March 22, 1966, I report them with concern, for they are awfully risky inflation stuff in an economy as boomy as ours.

In fairness, it must be emphasized that economists in private life also were way under in their January estimates, but they can upgrade their figures behind closed doors and they have no responsibility for policy. The administration's estimates are in a 306-page book. These figures must be changed in public and must be the basis for policies affecting everyone.

Byelorussian Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

MR. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 weeks I have been privileged to speak before gatherings in my home State of New York on the occasion of the 48th anniversary of Byelorussian independence.

The United Byelorussian-American Commemorative Committee held a rally for Americans of Byelorussian descent at the Astor Hotel, New York City, on March 20, which I had the honor of addressing.

At this meeting, a very forthright resolution was passed, and I would like to bring it to the attention of the House:

RESOLUTION OF THE RALLY OF AMERICANS OF
BYEORUSSIAN DESCENT

Whereas in the historical past Byelorussia was an independent country which in 1795 was conquered by the czarist Russia Empire;

Whereas at the time of collapse of czarist Russian Empire in 1917, the first Byelorussian Congress satirized restoration of independent Byelorussia, but was dispersed by armed forces of Soviet Russia;

Whereas on March 25, 1918, the Council of Byelorussian Democratic Republic proclaimed the national independence of Byelo-

ruссия, which subsequently was attacked, conquered and subjugated by Soviet Russia and Poland;

Whereas at the end of the Second World War in 1944 the Second Byelorussian Congress confirmed the proclamation of independence of Byelorussian Democratic Republic, but Byelorussia was conquered again by Soviet Russia;

Whereas the Soviet Russia created the fictitious state—the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, included her into USSR and completely subordinated to the Soviet Russian Government in Moscow;

Whereas the Soviet Russian Government is continuously applying in Byelorussia a colonial rule to benefit the Russian empire and Russian people, committing outrageous crimes against Byelorussian people;

1. By partition of Byelorussian ethnographical territory. Only less than half of it has been included within the Byelorussian SSR. Over half of Byelorussia has been annexed to the Russian SFSR;

2. By murder or deportation to concentration camps in Russia over 6 million of Byelorussian population. Russia is continuously using deportations of young people from Byelorussia to various forms of forced labor and to concentration camps in Soviet Russia;

3. By colonizing Byelorussia by the settlement of Russians, mostly Communists, providing the preferential treatment to them in relation to Byelorussian population. All leading administrative posts in Byelorussian SSR are filled with Russians;

4. By enormous economical exploitation of Byelorussia to the benefit of Russia;

5. By forcible superimposition on Byelorussian people a kolkhoz-slavery system for peasants, a forced labor conditions for industrial workers, and concentration camp system of work without pay;

6. By oppression of religious life of all denominations in Byelorussia;

7. By russification of Byelorussian people with the aim for complete merge them into one Soviet Russian nation.

Whereas the Soviet Russia and Communist China at this time are trying to expand their Communist domination by military aggression in South Vietnam, and are preparing similar conquests of other countries of the free world:

Now, therefore, we, the participants of the above mentioned rally, are protesting against occupation of Byelorussia by Soviet Russia, we are asking you, sir, to take the necessary steps for support of the aims of the Byelorussian people for their liberation from Soviet Russian colonialism; we are approving as completely right the action of American Government and the allies in South Vietnam, stopping the Communist conquest of free countries.

New Commissioner of Indian Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 31, 1966

MR. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the neglected needs of American Indians are belatedly but surely coming more sharply into focus, a promising figure has emerged into whose experienced and able hands the interests of our Indian population are being placed. That figure is Robert La Follette Bennett, recently nominated to

be the new Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Mr. Bennett possesses many attributes and qualifications that make his selection an outstanding one. Two of them are immediately discernible and especially notable: First, he has been a career employee of the Bureau of Indian Affairs for 29 years, and since last October has served as Deputy Commissioner; and second, he, himself is an Indian.

Mr. Bennett was born on the Oneida Indian Reservation in Outagamie County in the Eighth Wisconsin District which I have the honor to represent in this body. He is a graduate of De Pere High School and attended St. Norbert College. Later he was graduated from Haskell Institute in Kansas where he qualified for a civil service position with the Bureau.

Only one other Indian before Mr. Bennett served as Commissioner, and that was under President Grant from 1869 to 1871.

Mr. Bennett is the father of six children. He is a veteran of World War II, having served with the U.S. Marines. His last assignment with the Indian Bureau prior to his appointment as Deputy Commissioner was as the Bureau's area director in Juneau, Alaska.

This change in the Bureau's leadership provides an excellent opportunity for the country to reexamine its obligations and responsibilities to its citizens of Indian birth, and to do something about them.

I congratulate Mr. Bennett on this recognition of his years of outstanding service to his country and our Indian Americans especially, and extend very best wishes for continued success in his new assignment.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks an editorial concerning Mr. Bennett's appointment which appeared in the March 27 edition of the Green Bay Press-Gazette. The editorial follows:

THE BENNETT APPOINTMENT

The nomination of Robert La Follette Bennett, a native of Oneida, as commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs will provide the Nation with an opportunity to focus fresh attention on the neglected problems of its Indian population.

While the Nation has before it constant discussion and proposals for the economic problems of urban slums and distressed areas of white population, like Appalachia, it has paid little attention to the economic distress of decades in Indian reservations. The reservations, a reflection on our history, often are in remote sections of the Nation and on land with no agricultural or industrial potential.

Bennett will replace Philleo Nash, another Wisconsin native, and the circumstances of the Nash resignation underline the complexity of the Indian economic plight.

From what can be learned, Nash aroused the ire of his superior, Interior Secretary Udall, when he halted plans to move a garment factory from New York to an Indian reservation in Arizona, Udall's home State. Nash's position was that there is no point in curing one economic problem by creating unemployment elsewhere, and in this case he was right.

Bennett, a graduate lawyer, has devoted all his Government career since 1952 to Indian problems either with the Bureau of Indian Affairs or with the Veterans Administration.